UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,629	03/09/2006	Mauro Gelli	6672/PCT	7215

6858 7590 10/13/2009

BREINER & BREINER, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 320160
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-0160

EXAMINER	
MUSSER, BARBARA J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1791	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ATTACHMENT

Regarding applicant's argument that Ruppel does not disclose two embossing patterns on the same ply, Biagiotti does.

Regarding applicant's argument that if printing and embossing occur on the same ply, degradation is a consequence which examiner's rejection does not correct, whether the amount of degradation is acceptable is dependent on the desires of the manufacturer. It is noted that applicant prints on the ply after embossing which applicant points out Ruppel indicates causes degradation of the image, and clearly the degradation is acceptable in that instance. Applicant specifically states on page 12 of the arguments dated 9/21/09 that printing and then embossing can avoid degradation but does not state how or why the degradation does not occur.

Regarding applicant's argument that Ruppel teaches that when printing and embossing occur on the same ply, degradation occurs, Ruppel teaches that when embossing of a design occurs AFTER printing of the design(presumably at a different station since Ruppel also references synchronizing printing and embossing), degradation occurs. This is not the same thing.

Regarding applicant's argument that examiner is modifying Ruppel to have the embossing and printing occur on the same ply, examiner is modifying Biagiotti to print on the interior of the plies and also modifying it to print and apply glue to the same ply. This effectively prints on the same ply as is embossed, but is not a modification of Ruppel. Examiner is not modifying Ruppel, but rather Biagiotti.

Regarding applicant's arguments that Ruppel is directed to synchronizing embossing and printing and preventing printing before embossing, Ruppel is also directed to removing the problems associated with coloring the adhesive and with printing on the outside of the ply.

Regarding applicant's argument that Ruppel wants to synchronize embossing and printing, examiner is not taking the entire device of Ruppel and placing it in the device of Biagiotti. Rather, examiner is taking the concept of printing on the interior of the ply and applying it to Biagiotti. Additionally, when using the interior printing of Ruppel in Biagiotti, since the printing is applied to the embossments, one in the art would have appreciated it would have been applied while the ply was still on the embossing roll, effectively synchronizing the printing and embossing.

Regarding applicant's argument that one would not have modified Ruppel to print and emboss on the same ply, Ruppel already teaches printing and embossing on the same ply. The reference does not print and emboss on separate plies to fix synchronization and avoid degradation, it prints on the ply still on the embossing roll to synchronize and avoid degradation, which can be done in Biagiotti.

Regarding applicant's argument that changing printing and gluing from separate plies to the same ply would go against the teachings of Ruppel, examiner is not modifying Ruppel, but rather modifying Biagiotti.

Regarding applicant's argument that Biagiotti and Ruppel are inconsistent, the choice of printing on the same ply as the glue is applied may not work when the two are

applied to the same embossments, but Biagiotti has two sets of embossments, each of which can have a different material applied to them.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARBARA J. MUSSER whose telephone number is (571)272-1222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571)-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BJM
/B. J. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Richard Crispino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791